



United States Government

**OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD  
1015 HALF STREET SE  
WASHINGTON, DC 20570**

June 21, 2016

Re: Williams-Sonoma Direct, Inc.  
Case 21-RC-176174

**REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REQUEST FOR REVIEW  
OF REGIONAL DIRECTOR'S DECISION AND ORDER**

This is in response to Petitioner's request for an extension of time to file a request for review of the Regional Director's Decision and Order in the above-referenced case. This request for an extension of time was filed on June 20, 2016. The due date for the request for review is today, June 21, 2016.

In its request, the Petitioner states that "[t]o avoid unnecessary expense, Local 63 did not order a copy of the hearing transcripts until after it decided to request a review of the Order. Local 63 only received a copy of the transcripts on June 20, 2016, a day before its Request for Review is due." Petitioner further states that "Local 63's inability to access the transcripts substantially hindered its preparation of the Request." Petitioner provides no other reason for seeking an extension.

Section 102.111(b) of the Board's Rules and Regulations specifies that "[r]equests for extensions of time filed within three days of the due date must be grounded upon circumstances not reasonably foreseeable in advance." Petitioner states that it did not order the transcripts ". . . until after it decided to request a review of the Order." However, the Employer aptly points out in its opposition to the extension that the Petitioner "does not specify when it actually requested the transcripts such that it is impossible to tell whether its claimed inability to prepare a Request for Review is due to a delay in the reporter's preparation of the transcripts or an unreasonable delay on the part of the Union in requesting the transcripts."

In addition, no reason is given for why the request for extension of time was not reasonably foreseeable such that the request could not be filed at least three days prior to the due date for the request for review. If the hearing transcript was not received by Petitioner until June 20<sup>th</sup>, the Petitioner would have known on June 16<sup>th</sup> (three business days prior to the due date) that it had not yet received the transcript. Petitioner

therefore could have filed its request for extension of time more than three days prior to the due date for the document.

As the grounds for the Petitioner's extension request do not constitute unforeseen circumstances, I am unable to grant the request. Accordingly, it is denied, and the request for review is due on June 21, 2016.

/s/ Roxanne L. Rothschild  
Deputy Executive Secretary

cc: Parties